

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1, 10-12, 15 and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Christopher et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,058,013) in view of *Kamioka* (JP 04-113695).

Claims 6, 7, 13 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Christopher et al.* in view of *Kamioka* and further in view of *Miyagi et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,506,755).

Claims 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Christopher et al.* in view of *Kamioka*.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are improper and therefore should be withdrawn. Accordingly, claims 1, 6, 7, 10-13 and 15-22 remain pending.

The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1, 10-12, 15 and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Christopher et al.* in view of *Kamioka*. Claims 6, 7, 13 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Christopher et al.* in view of *Kamioka* and further in view of *Miyagi et al.* Claims 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Christopher et al.* in view of *Kamioka*. The rejections are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

With respect to independent claims 1 and 15, Applicant respectfully submits that *Christopher et al.* and *Kamioka*, whether taken singly or combined, do not teach or suggest the claimed combination, including at least “said second heat radiating pattern has a larger area than that of said first heat radiating pattern.”

The Office Action alleges that while *Christopher et al.* fails to disclose that the second radiating pattern has a larger area than the first heat radiating pattern, *Kamioka* discloses “heat radiating patterns 12 (see Fig. 3)” where its underside has a larger area than its upper side. Applicant respectfully disagrees. As shown in Fig. 3 and further described in the last paragraph of left column of page 541 of *Kamioka*, the element 12 is a silicon insulation sheet which is used for insulating a heating element 8 from a frame 3 and providing a good contact status. In addition, the element 12 is a rubber-made insulating sheet which has different physical properties from that of the radiating plate of the present invention. In other words, heat conductivity is usually considered in forming a radiating plate but not in forming an insulating sheet. As a matter of fact, *Kamioka* discloses in its specification that the heat radiating route of a heating device 8 relies on a frame 3 such that, on top of the frame 3, a through hole 6 is filled with silicon grease or solder in order to improve the heat radiating functionality of the heating device 8. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in *Kamioka* that the element 12 is used as heat radiating patterns, as claimed. Therefore, *Kamioka*

fails to teach or suggest at least “said second heat radiating pattern has a larger area than that of said first heat radiating pattern” as recited in independent claims 1 and 15.

As discussed above, *Christopher et al.* fails to disclose the claimed combination, at least in which “said second heat radiating pattern has a larger area than that of said first heat radiating pattern.” Furthermore, *kamioka* and *Miyagi et al.* do not overcome the deficiencies of *Christopher et al.* Thus, even assuming that *Christopher et al.*, *Kamioka* and *Miyagi et al.* can be properly combined, which we disagree, the combination of these three references still does not teach or suggest that “said second heat radiating pattern has a larger area than that of said first heat radiating pattern” as recited in independent claims 1 and 15.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection of independent claims 1 and 15 under 103(a) should be withdrawn because *Christopher et al.*, *Kamioka*, and *Miyagi et al.* whether taken singly or combined, do not teach or suggest at least the above cited feature of independent claims 1 and 15. As pointed out in MPEP § 2143.03, “[t]o establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 409 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).” Furthermore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections of dependent claims 6, 7, 10-13 and 16-22 should also be withdrawn at least because of their dependence upon respective independent claims 1 and 15 and for the reasons set forth above.

With no other rejection pending, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 6, 7, 10-13 and 15-22 are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion


In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments to place the application in clear condition for allowance or, in the alternative, in better form for appeal. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.R.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully Submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By:



K. Karen Loewenstein

Reg. No. 41,161

Dated: January 3, 2003

Customer No.: 009629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: (202) 739-3000

Facsimile: (202) 739-3001